



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.       | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/923,627            | 08/07/2001  | Akira Tagawa         | 70840/56,373        | 2079             |
| 21874                 | 7590        | 11/07/2003           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP |             |                      | SAID, MANSOUR M     |                  |
| P.O. BOX 9169         |             |                      | ART UNIT            |                  |
| BOSTON, MA 02209      |             |                      | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |

2673

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/923,627

Applicant(s)  
Akira Tagawa et al.

Examiner  
Mansour M. Said

Art Unit  
2673



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mansour M. Said (PTO)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) George W. Hartnell, III (applicant's Representative)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Oct 29, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, and 8

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Yoshihara et al. (6,115,016) and Kondoh et al. (6,509,887)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner discussed claim 1 with (applicant's Representative). He argued that the prior art does not disclose the claimed limitation. However, Examiner suggested that claims 4 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Mansour M. Said  
Examiner's signature, if required